

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-42, 44-50, 52 and 54-57 are pending in the above-captioned application. Claim 8 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer herein, while claims 2, 43, 51 and 53 were cancelled by previous amendment. Independent claims 1, 27, 50 and 52 have been amended herein to more clearly claim the desired embodiments of the invention. New claims 54-57 have been added herein. These amendments and new claims introduce no new matter and support is replete throughout the specification (e.g., see paragraph [0044] therein). These amendments are made without prejudice to renewal of the claims in their original form and are not to be construed as abandonment or dedication of the previously claimed subject matter or agreement with any objection or rejection of record.

I. Terminal Disclaimer

In the interest of fostering compact and expedited prosecution, Applicants are submitting a Terminal Disclaimer concurrently herewith to overcome any potential double patenting rejection concerning co-owned, co-pending Application Ser. No. 11/106,340 filed April 13, 2005. The filing of this Terminal Disclaimer is not an admission of the propriety of any such rejection. *Quad Environmental Technologies Corp. v. Union Sanitary District*, 946 F.2d 870, 20 USPQ2d 1392 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 3-42, 44-50, and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Applicants admitted prior art in view of Koyama et al. (US Pub. 20020024489) ("Koyama") and Avouris et al. (U.S. Pub. 20040061422) ("Avouris"). Claim 50 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Applicants admitted prior art in view of Koyama and Roesner et al. (U.S. Pub. 2003/0132461) ("Roesner").

Again, Applicants do not concede that Avouris is properly prior art to the Applicants' claimed inventions. Applicants reserve the right to establish invention dates

for the claimed inventions that are on or before the effective 35 U.S.C. §102(e)/103(a) date of Avouris relied on in the Office Action.

Independent claims 1, 27, 50 and 52 have been amended herein to recite that the claimed pixel transistors include a plurality of nanowires including a core made of a first material and a shell layer made of a second material disposed about said core, wherein the first material is compositionally different from the second material. Nowhere is it seen in the prior art of record where there is disclosure or suggestion of a pixel nanowire transistor comprising a plurality of nanowires extending between a first source electrode and first drain electrode of the transistor, wherein the nanowires include a core made of a first material and a shell layer made of a second material disposed about said core, wherein said first material is compositionally different from said second material.

Accordingly, it is believed that the rejection has been overcome, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1, 27, 50, and 52 be withdrawn. Claims 3-7, 9-26 and 54-55 depend from claim 1, claims 28-42, 44-49 and 56 depend from claim 27, and claim 57 depends from claim 50, and are believed to be allowable for at least these reasons. It is thus respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn as well.

Respectfully submitted,



Andrew L. Filler
Reg. No. 44,107

NANOSYS, INC.
2625 Hanover Street
Palo Alto, CA 94304
Tel. (650) 331-2176
Fax (650) 331-2101